

I've read most of HR 4026 and have tried to understand the connection between local programming (assumed AM frequency) and satellite providers. The main concern seems to be advertising dollars to keep the local stations operational. I say this because the other noted concern is the need for listeners to be provided with valuable information in the event of a local emergency, should the local stations be unable to stay in business. In my local area there are successful AM and FM stations available to us in the event of an emergency. They broadcast a wide area to many rural areas. So the concern would be the stations in very rural areas that have no large cities nearby. If the government wants to maintain the availability of local broadcasting they should financially support those rural stations based on some criteria such as availability of other signals and listener count during non-emergency times.

Satellite radio is a paid service and they should be able to broadcast whatever their listeners are interested in. How local will they really get? Are they going to give the traffic report in Nappanee, IN?...even the weather there? Isn't this really about Chicago, Cleveland, and other big cities where there are successful free radio broadcasts.

Should the satellite provider be required to broadcast all local information to all localities if they should be allowed to broadcast any local information anywhere? Is the issue still that the government wants free broadcast of emergency information via AM/FM frequency? Are they really the same issues? Will limiting one really save the other?

I respectfully urge the FCC to reject the NAB's petition 04-160.

Thank You.